

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

---

LISA BRUNO,

Plaintiff,

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

---

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

CASE NO. 1:20-cv-02633

OPINION & ORDER  
[Resolving Doc. [1](#)]

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

Plaintiff Bruno seeks judicial review of the Social Security Administration Commissioner's final decision denying Plaintiff's application for a Period of Disability and Disability Insurance Benefits.<sup>1</sup>

In support of her request for review, Plaintiff argues that the Administrative Law Judge's determination regarding her residual functional capacity and her manipulative limitations is not supported by substantial evidence.<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff further argues that the Administrative Law Judge erroneously relied on incomplete and insufficient vocational expert testimony regarding job availability.<sup>3</sup> Defendant disagrees.<sup>4</sup>

On December 3, 2021, Magistrate Judge Thomas Parker issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") recommending that the Court affirm the Commissioner's final decision denying Plaintiff Bruno's application.<sup>5</sup> Plaintiff did not file objections to the R&R.

---

<sup>1</sup> Doc. [1](#). Plaintiff and Defendant filed merits briefs. Docs. [13](#); [14](#).

<sup>2</sup> Doc. [13](#) at 9–12.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 12–17.

<sup>4</sup> Doc. [14](#).

<sup>5</sup> Doc. [15](#).

Case No. 1:20-cv-02633  
Gwin, J.

The Federal Magistrates Act requires district courts to conduct a *de novo* review of only objected-to portions of an R&R.<sup>6</sup> Absent objection, district courts may adopt an R&R without review.<sup>7</sup> Plaintiff did not object to the R&R, and this Court may adopt Magistrate Judge Parker's R&R without further review.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Parker's R&R, and **AFFIRMS** the Commissioner's final decision.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 13, 2022

s/ James S. Gwin  
JAMES S. GWIN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>6</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

<sup>7</sup> *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–52 (1985). Failure to timely object may waive a party's right to appeal the district court's order adopting the R&R. *Id.* at 155; *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949–50 (6th Cir. 1981).